

**CACCC Meeting  
September 15, 16, 2003  
Wabash, Indiana**

**ATTENDEES:**

**Council members:** Chuck Bauer, Paula Yeager, Pete Hanebutt, Frank Keeton, David Dimmich, Doug Metcalf, Doug Allman, Glenn Lange, Gene Hopkins, Brad Thurston

**Facilitator:** Tom Wasson; **Recorder:** Jeanne Odaffer; **Secretary:** Debbie Bray

**Resource Person:** Dr Wayne Cunningham

**Guests:** 10-12 members of the public attended various portions of the meeting.

**MEETING AGENDA TOPICS:**

- 1) Housekeeping & Meeting Logistics
- 2) Resource Materials: What's available, what's coming, what's needed
- 3) Photo Tour
- 4) Public Input Session
- 5) ID Issues to accomplish the charge of CACCC
- 6) Presentation by Resource Speaker
- 7) Tour Bellar's Farm
- 8) Debrief after Tour
- 9) What Next?

**MEETING NOTES:**

**1) HOUSEKEEPING & MEETING LOGISTICS**

**Meeting Reports –**

- Meeting notes should remain "draft" until following meeting for editing and approval by the council. The draft report will be emailed to council as soon as available. The Meeting Report will not posted on the website until approved.
- Meeting Report for August 28, 2003 - Meeting Report approved by council with a couple of minor corrections.

**Communication:**

- To facilitate decisions and to allow for sharing of information
- Debbie Bray will provide a list of home and email addresses and personal phone numbers.
- If a council members has an idea (resource person, tour site, etc.) which will involve some major logistical effort or expenditure they will first contact the two agency representatives to check on feasibility and will keep the council members advised. All decisions of this natural will be done by consensus.
- Considerable discussion about talking to the media or the public and when a council members presents themselves, their organization or the council. It was agreed that each council member had the responsibility to make the media and/or public know "which hat" the council member was wearing.
- Council members are asked to reply to Debbie Bray's emails. This will insure that council members received the emails. If no reply Debbie will follow up with a phone call.

**Public Input:**

- Debbie will distribute any emails the website receives as they are received and also provide a "hard copy" of all emails and letters at the next meeting
- To accommodate individuals who cannot attend council meetings all day, a short public input session will be built into the meetings just before the noon break. This fact will be put in the news releases.

**Website:**

- To clarify the purpose of the council on the website and in all news releases "(deer family)" will be inserted behind the word "cervid".

The council was advised that Dr. Wayne Cunningham, Colorado Department of Agriculture's State Veterinarian, was traveling to Michigan for a conference on Tuesday and was available to discuss CWD. The council decided to take advantage of this opportunity and invited him to speak in the late afternoon.

**2) RESOURCE MATERIALS**

What's Available: Several of the council members showed examples of suggested reading or had materials to share. Below is some of that information

- 1) Beyond Fair Chase and Inherit the Hunt by Jim Posewitz These books deal with the concept of "fair chase" and North American Model (Wildlife Management Plan)
- 2) DNR - The Hunter in Conservation
- 3) Dr. David Samuel "Know Hunting" deals with ethics and attitudes.
- 4) Isaac Walton League - Policy Statement on the Opposition to Deer/Elk Farms.
- 5) Other items were distributed during the meeting.

### **What's Coming**

- 1) 1. Wisconsin Survey and Southeast Co-op Captive Cervid Survey (will be provided by Paula Yeager)
- 2) North American Elk Breeders Report Economic Impact: Council would like information broke down by animal. (to be provided by Frank Keeton)
- 3) Mission of Board of Animal Health (Doug Metcalf) to be given to Council members.

### **What's Needed: The following items were discussed.**

- 1) Clarification about permit(s) for each facility that has white tailed deer
- 2) BOAH, for purpose of disease control, consider cervids as livestock. All cervid including white tailed deer. Includes meat inspection of: ratites, big birds, cattle, swine, sheep, goats, cervids, bison.
- 3) Who has white tailed deer?
- 4) Who has "other Cervids"?
- 5) Who are the Rehabilitators?
- 6) Shooting - White tailed deer "wild" whether captive or not
- 7) There is a misalignment between BOAH and DNR regulations
- 8) Need to see the 50 state questionnaire and regulations from each state. (Glenn Lange to provide this information)
- 9) Plus what shooting facilities are available in Indiana (Glenn Lange to provide this information)
- 10) A survey of Cervids "owners" was discussed including some of the questions, however because of the questionable response it was decided to not try to do one.
- 11) CWD LIVE testing - not readily available
- 12) Total Economic impact of hunting to be provided by Glenn Lange
- 13) Total economic impact of Cattle business (beef) - to be provided by Pete Hanebutt

- 14) Cost of Management of White tailed (income and outlay) to be provided by DNR
- 15) Cost of Regulating and Inspecting (income and outlay) to be provided by BOAH
- 16) Hunting license paid for Conservation Officers work on cervids "paid by hunters"
- 17) What do we know about "other" captive cervids?? - opportunity for disease, hunter ethics, fair chase.

### **3) PHOTO TOUR -Presentation by Doug Metcalf**

Several facilities were visited on a couple of days. After viewing the presentation the following are questions, comments and impressions on the farms viewed:

- What kind of stress do the animals have on these farms?
- Testing - annual if not moving deer
- Natural "winter loss? Due to stress?
- Testing of all fatalities of animals (post mortem)
- What kind of tests? 1. TB, 2. CWD, 3. further Purdue testing
- Fencing is an issue
- Amish - 40 deer average 10 to 15 acres - breeding main business mostly naturally inseminated.
- Proximity of buck to doe during rut
- Animals need testing to have best status
- Impressions of possible issues:

Fencing, Testing, ID individual animal, slaughter for meat, stress management

**4) PUBLIC INPUT: To accommodate the public, comments were taken in the afternoon and during the evening.**

### **Rehabilitator**

- Send email to council on Sunday
- Disease was top priority
- Opposed to importation of animals because of increased possibility of disease

- Opposes "canned hunting"

### **Landowner**

- Hunting Adjacent to populated areas is a safety issue.
- 1500 acre farm NOT norm. 40 acres are the usual size.
- Believes there are legal issues: the farm owner versus the people on the other side of the fence (incidental observers children etc).
- He said the Council should consider Fair chase and hunter ethics along with size of area, property values and consider rezoning.

**5) ISSUES :** The council developed a list of issues that must be address to complete the charge given the council.

1) a. Conflict/Contradiction between two Agencies

Board of Animal Health

Department of Natural Resources

- b. Who has the authority to regulate what
- c. Consistency in regulation
- d. Herd health density
- e. Is white tailed "wild"

2) How to identify animals traceability/ Trackability , Accountability

Clarify what is "wild" definition of wild white tailed deer. Captive white tailed deer. At what point does animal become domestic, what authority does DNR have to regulate.

4) Hunter Ethics a. Fair Chase

Wildlife as public trust

Fencing Standards

- 1. Height, types

2. Ingress/egress
3. Dual barrier

6) Standard identification for animals. Clarifying type: plastic, metal

7) Health - Control Disease:

- a. game farming can allow for disease transfer
- b. Fencing
- c. Accountability
- d. Baiting
- e. Importation
- f. Marketing
- g. Genetic pollution

8) Where do "pets" (deer) fit into this process? Permitting process. Rehabilitators.

9) Identify markets for each of these types of deer - cervid (elk, deer, etc.)

10) Realistically what are the chances for middle ground.

11) Print truthful/ Accurate materials

12) Illegal taking of wild animals (poaching) - way to differentiate "captive" meat

13) Concern for impact of "Farm Hunting" (commercial) on Pitman Robinson funds - hunting licensing

14) Identification of antlers to protect fair chase (record books). Distinguish difference between penned and wild.

15) Disease Transmission from wild to captive herds

16) Wild Cervids - Habitat fragmentation 2. fencing public wildlife 3. markets for dead wildlife promoting illegal taking of public wildlife 4. Lacey act

17) Different rules of slaughter of cervids(white tailed deer - No; Elk - yes). Inspected at slaughter plant.

18) Harvesting, taking, slaughter all different. (rifle hunting). Different taking methods and who has authority captive vs. wild

19) How to better regulate - enforce rules - new and existing.

20) How fenced hunts have different standards. Difference between governmental vs. private hunts.

21) Definition of 1. Captive 2. Private owned 3. Wild. What is required (paperwork) for cervid farms, who is responsible?

22) Cost allocation

23) Fencing Public Wildlife - Inclusive and exclusion = taking of States resources

24) Financial Impact of existing or new regulations on Industry

25) Ecosystem Impacts -Lucrative large-scale game farming is the opposite of ecosystem wildlife management. -Game farming, ignores those wildlife populations that do not have economic value. - Does not support habitat requirements or protection for producing diverse wildlife populations. - Attempts to control wildlife populations that interfere with the production of the valuable livestock. - Follows economic bottom line management, not scientific, ecosystem management. (text taken from IDNR issue list)

26) Impact of this Council on other groups - economic interests/consumers

27) Permit holder allowed to keep multiple types of cervids? Allowed on same facility/site.

28) How Cervid farms affect wildlife species to the positive/benefit.

29) Wildlife cervid management issues - game farming produces situations that are dangerous to or incompatible with naturally occurring wildlife populations. Produces genetically altered animals - animals many generations removed from wild animals and bred primarily for antler growth are a genetic and disease threat to wild animals when they inevitably escape. Large scale fenced operations contribute to habitat fragmentation making the production of wildlife habitat more difficult. Often fences in public wildlife, preventing natural movement, removing them from public control and scientific management based on what is good for all wildlife. Creates markets for dead wildlife; encourages poaching and the laundering of illegally killed public wildlife. (text taken from IDNR issue list)

30) "Canned" hunt - Definition, regulations

31) Negative perception public has of hunting and hunters which is created by "fenced hunts"

32) Social Issues - When cervids are privately owned, the public is barred, in many cases, from access to that wildlife and from having direct input on its management - public ownership of wildlife allows public processes and publicly supported scientific management. - hunting behind wire is considered by many to be unethical - Most deer used on shooting preserves are many generations removed from wild deer - Many shooting facilities guarantee success - Shooting over baited sites is an additional issue - Allowing hunting activities that are opposed by the majority of the public creates anti-hunting sentiment - fair chase hunting and the taking of an animal for other than food or fur is not supported by the majority of the public. - Wildlife is allocated to the public favoring neither social status or land ownership; Every citizen has access as regulated by elected officials - Game farming allocates wildlife by the market place - if you don't pay you have no access or opportunity. -Public wildlife is not for sale - In our opinion, game farms exist primarily to sell dead wildlife to the highest bidder - the hobby farmer is the only exception. - To be successful, game farming requires unfettered private ownership of wildlife. - Removing the control of game farming from wildlife management agencies and placing it under the control of an "Agricultural Agency" weakens the public's control of its wildlife, may create regulations that preserve economic gain at a high cost to wildlife management, and eliminates, in many cases, input from wildlife management professionals. - Bottom line economic based management of captive animals is often not what is best for wildlife management. - Hunting behind wire is in direct competition with public wildlife management. - Game farming requires public funding resources to solve management problems created by for-profit operations. (text taken from IDNR issue list)

33) Zoning - Taxes - captive cervids - different usages different taxes?

34) Deer production people don't have contact point with agencies for information - Especially DNR

35) Gamebreeders Permit needs to require additional information, purpose of facility

36) Need to have Wildlife Vet?

**6) PRESENTATION:** Dr. Wayne Cunningham, Colorado Department of Agriculture State Veterinarian reviewed Chronic Wasting Disease.

- Reviewed the life history of CWD. CWD found in 1967 and was at Ft. Collins in a research herd that was captured from the wild: \*Animals were shipped to other research facilities. \* 10 Mule deer went to Denver zoo, 2000 went to Dr. Casey, Montana, Oklahoma, and Saskatchewan. These can all be traced back to this research facility. Others were turned loose back into the wild.



- This research herd captured from the wild to the so called captive herd. All CWD can be traced back this research facility.
- The origin, naturally occurring or jump from sheep at the research facility through experiment? Symptoms at 18 to 24 months are the longest incubation for lab-infected animals. There have been reports of 12 yr. old animals showing symptoms. Undocumented reports as long as 10-12 yrs. Incubation as long as 5 yrs (60 Months)
- CWD has never gone from inside the fence to the wild it has always gone from the wild to inside the fence.
- CWD is up to 33% in free roaming elk and deer in some areas of Colorado
- Reviewed the problems in Colorado and other states and how CWD is being addressed
- Other comments
- Wisconsin in his opinion, did they waste their time? Answer: If you annihilate population it decreases drift contamination
- Some environmental transmission of disease thru soil, plants, etc. etc
- Maybe a naturally occurring disease
- 5 years to restock if infected population. Disinfection of soil
- Good fencing double barrier 1 fence and 2 foot between second fence to be electric with high voltage (200) low amp.
- Carcass Spread: Not allow any products except processed meat into state -NO HEADS
- Contaminated Areas:
- Need Alkaline digestion - Clorox or Incineration over 500(
- Does not know how enters or exits animals. Ground contamination - has potential movement of disease.
- In Colorado, there is mandatory tagging of elk and required inventory to be kept. He believes this provides a check and balance regarding captive cervids. He stated Colorado depends on States to have Status/protocol for their state
- Financial incentive is great
- No voluntary program is acceptable
- How to take care of diseased wild population? He does not know, it is not his field.
- Is there a human health problem? He does not think so.
- Have deer left fenced areas? ANS: He only deals with elk and fallow deer. But bear dig under fence and deer will follow under

---

Public Comment 6:00 PM

1. Question asked of Dr. Cunningham as to the difficulty of ridding an area of the "CWD prion. Dr. Cunningham said the prion degrades over time, is resistant and hard to destroy may have a half life of 10 yrs.

## **September 16, 2003 (Second day of meeting)**

### **Attendees:**

**Council members:** Chuck Bauer, Paula Yeager, Pete Hanebutt, Frank Keeton, David Dimmich, Doug Metcalf, Doug Allman, Glenn Lange, Brad Thurston

**Facilitator:** Tom Wasson; **Recorder:** Jeanne Odaffer; **Secretary:** Debbie Bray

### **7) TOUR OF RUSS BELLAR'S FARM**

The council was met by Mr. Russ Bellar, who showed the council the facilities and answered questions.

### **8) DEBRIEFING OF BELLAR FARM TOUR:**

After returning from the tour, the council members shared their impression and thoughts.

- Nice Farming operation
- Concern about population increase of doe's over time. Lots of animals coming on property and coming off property.
- Type of facility could become certified.
- Similar to livestock operation.
- Reach consensus that "2" types and we don't want them to mix.
- No 50 foot set back on trees as stated by Mr. Bellar
- Fee structure questionable
- Have concern deer deprived of mother "training" "cervid skills".
- Behavior manipulation?
- Severe browse line
- Misconception as to the difficulty of hunting on "hunting preserve".
- Questions about the records shown. Numbers don't add up.
- 20-40 acre plot farms could become problem for deer hunting on site.
- Must plan for all contingencies.
- Need to ask for details if want specific questions answered.
- Need mechanism to deal with current problems and future problems.(role of this council)

- Looking at an explosive industry in its early stages Creates: a) lots of pens. b) impacts hunter ethics. c) Million dollar bucks
- CWD has caused "in state" industry to grow. (can't import)
- Long term results (if industry collapses) "more staff - less to do" for BOAH
- "Trophy" hunting started to honor deer. Now it honors hunter e.g. "Big racks"
- Long term will hurt hunting.
- Mixed "Commercial" with "Social" (public trust vs. capitalist which is private ownership)
- Money affects hunting anyway
- Losing hunters because no safe place to go to hunt. (Preserves safe places to go).
- Losing hunters because of different reasons.
- Meat market different for different species.

## 9) WHAT NEXT:

A discussion of the next meetings agenda topics and assignments.

1. Will provide the Issues in draft form as soon as possible, please review and be ready to discuss
2. At the next meeting will combine and prioritize the Issues
3. Want Wildlife Vet to speak, and a Wildlife Enforcement person from Wisconsin/Colorado (Mike Miller?- Wis, Bob Hillman? - Texas Vet)
4. Comment: there is a synergy of concern of wildlife proponents and farmers to prevent disease
5. Glenn Lange to get State Wildlife Vet and or Wildlife Enforcement to speak. Council authorized Glenn to get "a" person. First choice from Wisconsin or similar type of State as Indiana (white tailed species). Will keep council advised.
6. Doug Metcalf - provide a list of who is registered with BOAH and rules of BOAH to keep captive Cervids.
7. Decided no survey to be done by DNR and BOAH
8. Name tags should be printed front and back with name of group represented also.
9. Email copies with hard copy of public comments
10. Location of next meeting, first choice "Brown County" second choice "Spring Mill" Debbie Bray will let council know the arrangements.

11. Meeting in November will be in Delaware county
12. Start meeting in October at 9:00 AM, Public comment at 11:30 AM and 6:00 PM.  
Speakers in the morning, the afternoon will focus on the Issues.